

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

---

BRITTANY M. ATWOOD,	:	
	:	CASE NO. 1:13-CV-00703
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	OPINION & ORDER
	:	[Resolving Docs. <a href="#">11</a> & <a href="#">21</a> ]
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	:	
SECURITY,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

---

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On April 17, 2014, Magistrate Judge James R. Knepp II recommended that the Court affirm the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of supplemental security income to Plaintiff Brittany M. Atwood.<sup>1/</sup> Plaintiff Atwood has not filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation. The Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's decision.

The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to conduct a *de novo* review only of those portions of a Report and Recommendation to which the parties have made an objection.<sup>2/</sup> Parties must file any objections to a Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of service.<sup>3/</sup> Failure to object within that time waives a party's right to appeal the Magistrate Judge's

---

<sup>1/</sup>Doc. [21](#).

<sup>2/</sup>[28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#).

<sup>3/</sup>[Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(a\)](#).

Case No. 1:13-CV-00703

Gwin, J.

recommendation.<sup>4/</sup> Absent objection, a district court may adopt the Magistrate Judge's report without review.<sup>5/</sup> Moreover, having conducted its own review of the complaint<sup>6/</sup> and briefing,<sup>7/</sup> this Court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** in whole Magistrate Judge Knepp's findings of fact and conclusions of law and incorporates them fully herein by reference. The Court **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 6, 2014

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>4/</sup>*Id.*; see [Thomas v. Arn](#), 474 U.S. 140, 145 (1985); [United States v. Walters](#), 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

<sup>5/</sup>[Thomas](#), 474 U.S. at 149.

<sup>6/</sup>Doc. [1](#) (complaint); Doc. [11](#) (amended complaint).

<sup>7/</sup>Doc. [16](#) (Plaintiff's opening brief); Doc. [19](#) (Commissioner's brief); Doc. [20](#) (Plaintiff's reply brief).